REMARKS

Applicant's counsel thanks the Examiner for the careful consideration given the application. Claims 1-8 are currently pending in the application.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the portions (of the server component) are incrementally executed on the server computer in response to the one or more commands from the one or more command selectors for the client/server application. Support for the amendment to the claim 1 can be found, for example, on page 5, line 26 to page 6, line 2. No new matter has been introduced by way of the amendment to claim 1.

Claims 1, 3, 5, and 7 have been amended to replace "in communications with" with "in communication with". Claims 3, 5, and 7 have been amended to replace "," after "the at least one client computer" with ";". Claim 5 has been amended to replace "means" with "a module". Claim 7 has been amended to add "," between "a client/server application" and "leveraging". Claim 8 has been amended to replace "The method" with "The storage medium".

The amendment to claims 1, 3, 5, 7, and 8 is fully supported by the application as originally filed. No new matter has been introduced by way of the amendment to claims 1, 3, 5, 7, and 8.

The Examiner rejected claims 1 to 8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kevner (U.S. Patent No. 5,956,509). The rejections are respectfully traversed for reasons as set out below.

The present invention addresses the problem of execution times for a client/server application. To reduce the execution times for a client/server application, a system and method in accordance with the present invention incrementally executes the client/server application.

According to claim 1, a server component, which includes a plurality of portions, is provided on a server computer, and a client component, which includes one or more command selectors, is provided on a client computer. The selector includes: associated code for selecting a function available from the plurality of portions of the server components; and an associated parameter for use by the component in determining the appropriate portion of the plurality of portions to execute to provide the selected function. For executing a client/server application, the

5

portions are incrementally executed on the server computer. Thus, functions requested by the client computer are incrementally provided to the client computer in response to one or more request commands from the client computer.

The system executes a compact portion of the server-side application logic on the server computer to provide a fast executing initial portion of the application. Should the function requested lie outside the function set of the compact portion, an applicable additional executable portion is loaded and executed on the server computer, combining its function(s) with the first portion's function(s) (page 5, line 26 to page 6, line 2). Thus, the system and method enables a large decrease in the number of lines of script at initial runtime when compared with a full version of an application (page 6, lines 32 to 34).

Regarding the rejection of claim 1, the Examiner referred to col. 4, lines 30 to 35 of Kevner and stated that Kevner anticipates a system for incrementally executing a client/server application.

Col. 4, lines 30 to 35 of Kevner states:
-- Furthermore, the present invention optimizes <u>the efficient use of memory by subdividing a large data block into incremental data blocks</u>. The present invention then sends the incremental blocks over the wide area network. As the client receives each <u>incremental data block, the client immediately begins to use the incremental data blocks</u>. Furthermore, as the client uses each incremental data block the client frees the memory for other uses thus optimizing memory usage. -- [Emphasis added]

Thus, Kevner addresses data structure for memory management in a client computer, and does not address incrementally executing a client/server application by incrementally executing a plurality of portions on a server computer.

The Examiner stated that RequestDynamicParam routine (col. 28, lines 1 to 5 of Kevner) is an associated parameter recited in claim 1.

As disclosed on col. 17, lines 23 to 29 of Kevner, RequestDynamicParam routine is a routine executing <u>in the client MPC layer 20a</u>.

Col. 27, lines 43 to 51 of Kevner states:
-- Once the client WEATHER application 204a has passed all of the required static parameters needed to identify the desired map, the client WEATHER application

proceeds to state 1314. In this example, the weather map comprises dynamic data (i.e., the service MPC layer 206c will <u>download the weather map incrementally</u>). Thus, in state 1314 the client WEATHER application 204a calls <u>the RequestDynamicParam routine to specify that the weather map comprises dynamic data</u>. -- [Emphasis added]

Thus, RequestDynamicParam is to request a dynamic data, and is not a parameter which is forwarded to the server computer for use by the server computer in determining the appropriate portion of the portions to execute to provide the selected function for incrementally executing a client/server application. Kevner neither discloses nor suggests a combination of a code and a parameter as recited in claim 1.

With respect to the rejection of claim 3, the Examiner applied to claim 3 the same reasons as claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 3 specifies at step (iv) how an applicable portion is <u>additionally executed</u>. Kevner fails to disclose or suggest the step (iv) of claim 3, namely, executing an applicable <u>additional</u> portion of the plurality of portions of the server component for each request received from the client component for an application function <u>not available from any running portion or portions of the server component</u>.

Claim 5 is a system claim corresponding to method claim 3. Claim 7 is a storage medium claim corresponding to method claim 3. Thus, the above argument with respect to claim 3 is applied to claims 5 and 7.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 1 to 8 are patentable in view of the cited reference. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections.

In view of the above amendments and remarks and having dealt with all the objections raised by the Examiner, reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously requested.

If any additional fees are required by this communication, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, Order No. 33263US1.

Respectfully Submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By _John P. Murtaugh_

John P. Murtaugh, Reg. No. 34226

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: 5-23-05